



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/084,391 | 02/26/2002 | Gregory Gene Steiner | | 8379 |

49284 7590 07/05/2005

GREGORY GENE STEINER
590 FARRINGTON HWY. #524
SUITE 132
KAPOLEI, HI 96707

EXAMINER

COOK, REBECCA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

*Remailed Petition dec
due to address incorrectly
placed in system. B.H.*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FEB - 8 2005

GREGORY GENE STEINER
1676 ALA MOANA BLVD, # 104
HONOLULU, HI 96815

In re Application of
Gregory Gene Steiner
Serial No.: 10/084,391
Filed: February 26, 2002
Attorney Docket No.:

PETITION DECISION

This is in response to the telephone interview and informal petition under 37 CFR 4.181 and earlier status inquiries, from January, 2005, requesting withdrawal of abandonment based, in part, on an incorrect mailing address.

A review of the file history shows that this application was filed by applicant on February 26, 2002, and contained as a correspondence address PO BOX 61515, Honolulu, HI 96389. The examiner mailed a first Office action to this address on February 7, 2003, setting a three month shortened statutory period for reply. Applicant replied on March 4, 2003, by filing an amendment to the specification and claims. Unfortunately, due to Rules changes from the previous year, applicant's amendment was not in acceptable form. On June 5, 2003, the Office mailed a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment to applicant setting a one month period for reply. A change of address was received on June 16, 2003. Applicant replied on July 21, 2003, by filing a new amendment. However, applicant did not request or pay for a one month extension of time. Applicant was not notified of the fee deficiency until February, 2004, at which time a request and fee for a one month extension of time was submitted. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed to applicant on March 25, 2004, indicating that no reply to the Office action of February 7, 2003, had been received.

It is noted that applicant is prosecuting his own application and is likely not completely familiar with Rules changes for prosecution before the Office. It is also noted that the Office has changed its Rules for submission of amendments to the claims and specification at least three times since 2001. In view of these changes, it is understandable that applicant was not aware of the most recent Rule change for submitting amendments and the error in submission can be excused. It is also noted that applicant has attempted to reply to Office actions promptly, usually within a month of mailing thereof. That applicant did not reply within one month to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment may be due to the change of address which likely crossed in the mail with the Notice. However, the Office should not have delayed three months from receipt of the amendment to the mailing of the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, nor delayed over six

months after receipt of the revised amendment before notifying applicant that the amendment was defective in that it lacked an extension of time request and fee. Such delay, in effect, mandated abandonment of the application.

In view of the Office delays and errors and, applicant's status as *pro se*, the petition is **GRANTED**. This application is restored to pending status with the mailing of this decision.

Applicant's remarks filed March 7, 2003, will be considered responsive to the Office action of February 7, 2003, and the examiner will act in accordance therewith.

It is, however, noted that applicant's last amendment remains non-compliant with current Rules for amendments. Current Rules require that any amendment to the specification (other than the addition or deletion of 5 or fewer characters) be made by reproducing the entire paragraph and showing the changes by underlining (for additions) and strikethrough (for deletions). In addition when any claim is amended in reply to an Office action a complete listing of claims must be presented with changes shown as noted above. Further each claim must be preceded by an identifier such as: new, amended, previously amended, original, canceled, etc. Applicant is urged to review these Rules on the Office website to ensure compliance therewith. **The reply to the next Office action will require compliance with current Rules for amendments.**

Should there be any questions about this decision please contact William R. Dixon, Jr., by letter addressed to Director, TC 1600, at the address listed above, or by telephone at 571-272-0519 or by facsimile sent to the general Office facsimile number 571-273-8300.



Bruce M. Kisiuk
Director, Technology Center 1600